

Serial Number: 09/733847  
Docket No.: ARC2644R1

Page 6

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks which follow.

#### **PETITION TO RESET PERIOD FOR REPLY**

A petition to reset a period for reply due to late receipt of the office action dated April 5, 2005, was filed on August 15, 2005. A decision on the petition has not been received. This amendment is being filed without a request for time extension. If the petition is not granted, please apply any charges not covered in connection with this filing to Deposit Account No. 50-3202 (ref. ARC2644R1).

#### **DISPOSITION OF CLAIMS**

Claims 53, 55, 58-74 are pending in this application. Claims 54, 56, and 57 have been cancelled by this amendment. Claims 73 and 74 have been added by this amendment.

#### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 53-72 were rejected as being obvious over Rudnic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,952,004) in view of Eckenhoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,692,326). Rejection of claims 54, 56, and 57 is moot because these claims have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

Rudnic *et al.* do not teach a sustained release oral dosage form comprising a liquid antiviral drug composition consisting of an antiviral drug solubilized in a polysorbate surfactant, as recited in amended claim 53. Eckenhoff *et al.* also fail to overcome the deficiency in Rudnic *et al.*

From the foregoing, claim 53 is not obvious over Rudnic *et al.* in view of Eckenhoff *et al.* Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 53 is respectfully requested. Claims 55 and 58-72, being dependent on claim 53, are also patentable in view of the foregoing arguments.

Serial Number: 09/733847  
Docket No.: ARC2644R1

Page 7

### NEW CLAIMS

New claim 73 recites specific examples of the polysorbate surfactant recited in claim 53. Support for this claim can be found on pages 7 and 8 of the specification as originally filed.

New claim 74 recites specific examples of the protease inhibitor recited in claim 58. Support for this claim can be found on page 7 of the specification as originally filed.

### CONCLUSION

The rejected claims have been amended and/or shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicant believes that this paper is fully responsive to all the grounds of rejection cited by the Examiner in the Office Action dated April 5, 2005, and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/5/2005

Adenike Adebisi  
Adenike A. Adebisi  
Reg. No. 42,254  
Tel.: (281) 440-1712